## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims noting the following substantive argument with respect to the references.

Claims 1-4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Toth (WO 00/33142).

Claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the optical storage medium includes a polymer material that has an optically activated molecular transition so that it can be optically written and read at about the same wavelength. Toth uses a liquid crystal material that writes at either a blue or green wavelength and is read at a red wavelength. Toth fails to teach or suggest the use of about the same wavelength to both write and read the medium. Toth (page 7, lines 10-12, and page 10, lines 5-8) fails to disclose or suggest the storage medium of claim 1.

Claims 1-4 and 6-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rao ('525). However, Rao ('525) relates to a switch or modulator and is not used for storing and retrieving data in a medium. Rao does not disclose a medium that is readable and writeable at about the same wavelength.

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Natansohn ('381). However, Natansohn states only

"monitoring the light transmitted through a crossed polarizer setup." There is no further description of the light used to read
the medium. There is no indication that the medium is writeable
and readable with light at about the same wavelength. With regard
to Claim 7, Natansohn fails to disclose or suggest a system that
uses a first coherent light source and a second light source with
first and second polarization components, respectively, to record
information. Natansohn discloses the use on an argon laser
(column 7, line 65) to write or erase.

Claims 1-7 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Savant ('221). Savant teaches using different wavelengths to write and read the same portion of material. Savant fails to disclose or suggest writing and reading with about the same wavelength or using two different light sources to write on the medium (See Col. 20, lines 28-39).

Claims 1-11 and 23-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishii ('849). Ishii fails to disclose or suggest a medium that is written and read at about the same wavelength or that use two different light sources to write.

Claims 7, 12, 14 and 16-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or 103(a) as being anticipated by or obvious over Kawakubo.

-11-

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN, CAGNEEIF & LEBOVICY LLD TEL. (617) 542-2290 FAX. (617) 451-0313

As Kawakubo fails to disclose or suggest the use of a polymer film having the recited characteristics it fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Claim 1-27 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Ishii in view of Kawakubo, Savant and Tsujioka or further in view of Taniguichi and Taylor. These references fail to disclose alone, or in combination, a system or method of writing or reading at about the same wavelength. They also fail to disclose or suggest a system for storing information using two light sources as recited in Claim 7 or Claim 23. New Claims 28-32 have been added. The cited references fail to disclose a nonvolatile optical storage medium as recited in Claim 28. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WU ET AL.

THOMAS O. HOOVER
Registration No. 32,470

Registration No. 32,470 Attorney for Applicant(s)

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,
GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP
Ten Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: (617) 542-2290

Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

TOH/trb 328319

-13-